7th February 1924] [Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

"It is necessary to give to the House the details as to what exactly this refers to. This is practically the tail end of the events that led to the rebellion and to the establishment of the courts which had to deal with the matter arising out of the rebellion. An expenditure of about Rs. 12,220 was incurred during the current year on the special courts for the trial of offences which arose out of the Mappilla Rebellion. The Magistrates who sat in these courts were First-class Magistrates of the Deputy Collectors' cadre. No provision was made for this item in the budget as there was no information at that time as to whether the courts would function during the year and if so, for what period. The amount spent on the pay of the Magistrates included a special pay of Rs. 100 for each amounting to Rs. 10,000, and the amount for the establishment came to another Rs. 10,000. A statement of details of this expenditure will be placed on the table. This is the end of that category of expenditure, and I move that this supplementary grant be given."

The motion was put and carried and the grant was made.

V

AMENDMENTS TO STANDING ORDERS.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I beg to move that the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the amendments to Standing Order 44 (1) (i), which is placed on the table * of this House, may be taken into consideration."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"I second the motion."

The motion was put and carried.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I move that the two amendments that have been proposed consequential on the amendments to Standing Orders 46 and 49 may be passed at once."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried, and the amendments were passed.

VI

THE TUTICORIN PORT TRUST BILL.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The Council will now resume consideration of the Tuticorin Port Bill. We have to deal with clause 8."

Mr. P. Peddiraju, who had given notice of the following amendment to sub-clause (1) of clause 8, did not move it :—

Amendment to sub-clause (1), clause 8.

"*Add* the following as item (*f*) :—

'(*f*) *or is domiciled in any part of the British Empire or in any British possession in which discrimination is made by statute or by any rule having the force of law against resident Indians as such.*'"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, in the place of the amendment which was not moved, I beg leave to move the following as sub-clause (*f*) of clause 8 :—

'*or (f) not being an Indian by birth is domiciled in any British possession or Colony as defined in the Interpretation Act of* 1889 *the laws*

---

* Printed as Appendix V on pages 344–345 infra.